

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 MICHAEL B. WILLIAMS,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 MICHAEL WHELAN, et al.,
11 Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-02723-EMC](#)

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO LIFT THE STAY**

Docket Nos. 21-22

23 This *pro se* civil rights action was stayed on December 10, 2013, pursuant to the rule from
24 *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), because success on Plaintiff's claims would imply the
25 invalidity of pending civil commitment proceedings under California's Sexually Violent Predator
26 Act. The Court explained:

27 Here, Plaintiff's claims about the adequacy of his legal
28 representation, the propriety of the evaluations used as the basis for
his commitment, and the alleged conspiracy to keep him in custody
are intimately related to the SVPA civil commitment case. Success
on any of Plaintiff's claims would imply the invalidity of the
pending SVPA proceedings or any eventual commitment that might
occur. Accordingly, the Court will follow the path suggested by
Wallace [v. Kato, 549 U.S. 384, 393 (2007)], and stay further
proceedings in this matter until plaintiff's SVPA proceedings have
concluded.

29 If Plaintiff wants to challenge the lawfulness of his current
30 custody, the exclusive method by which he may do so in federal
31 court is by filing a petition for writ of habeas corpus. *See Preiser v.*
Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973). (Docket No. 14 at 4.)

32 Plaintiff now moves to lift the stay, and proceed with this action. He does not allege that
33 the SVPA proceedings have been dismissed or set aside, and his continued housing at the
34 Coalinga State Hospital suggests the SVPA proceedings are either still ongoing or at least have not
35 been set aside. The motion to lift the stay is **DENIED** because the reason for the stay -- the

1 pendency of the civil commitment proceedings -- still exists. Docket Nos. 21 and 22.

2 The Court notes that Plaintiff's federal petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the
3 civil commitment proceedings was denied, *see Williams v. King*, No. 14-cv-1831 PJH, and
4 currently is on appeal, *see Williams v. King*, Ninth Cir. Case No. 15-17499. Plaintiff should notify
5 this court of the Ninth Circuit's decision in that appeal when that decision is issued.

6 This order disposes of Docket Nos. 21 and 22.

7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: October 26, 2016



11
12 EDWARD M. CHEN
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28